



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/508,877 | 09/23/2004 | Bae Yun-Ki | 31758-207599 | 1125 |
| 26694 | 7590 | 02/01/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| VENABLE LLP | | | ZETTL, MARY E | |
| P.O. BOX 34385 | | | ART UNIT | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998 | | | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2875 | |

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

abr

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/508,877 | Applicant(s) YUN-KI, BAE | |
| | Examiner Mary Zettl | Art Unit 2884 | |
| | | | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/23/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification contains numerous grammatical errors such as "a bright color ski clothes..." (page 1, line 14), "user plays snowboarding..." (page 1, line 16), "accident may be increased..." (page 1, line 17). This is an exemplary listing only. The entire specification should be carefully reviewed and revised for grammatical informalities.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "a snowboard, luminescent snowboard" (line 1) renders the claim unclear. Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the same rotary shaft" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the housing" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 3 includes informal grammar, such as "a light of the.." (line 16). The claim should be revised for grammatical informalities. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manseth (US 4,864,860 A) in view of Tsai et al. (US 4,805,329 A).

Regarding claims 1-2, Manseth teaches a luminescent ski, comprising a generator (Figure 1, item 4; col. 2, line 20-21) mounted on the ski and utilized to supply power to a luminescent portion of the ski. The luminescent portion consists of light emitting diodes (Figure 1, item 30; col. 2, line 59). Manseth does not disclose expressly the generator including a permanent magnet and an induction coil. The use of a magnet and an induction coil for generating light is well known in the art. Tsai et al. teach a self-powered advertisement board including wind-driven illuminating units. The invention of Tsai et al. comprises a fan blade (Figure 1, item 01; col. 3, line 3) rotated by the force of the wind, a rotary shaft (Figure 1, item 9), a coil (Figure 1, item 050; col. 3, line 20) and a rotary magnet (Figure 1, item 051; col. 3, line 20) which are utilized to supply power to a light bulb (Figure 1, item 10; col. 3, line 13). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the power generator of Manseth such that it consisted of a magnet and coil as is a conventional power source in the art and as is suggested by Tsai et al. One of ordinary

Art Unit: 2875

skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to eliminate the reliance on a battery. Manseth also does not disclose expressly the use of a light on a snowboard, however one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized a snowboard as functionally equivalent to a pair of skis and would have been motivated to make similar modifications.

Regarding claim 3, Manseth in view of Tsai teach the limitations set forth in claim 2. Manseth in view of Tsai do not disclose expressly a transmission window. However at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the conventional use of a transmission window to protect light emitting diodes from outside elements. At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to ensure that in the invention of Manseth in view of Tsai a transmission window was provided in order to protect the LED components.

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi (JP 05-177027, cited by applicant) in view of Tsai et al. (US 4,805,329 A).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Takahashi teaches a luminescent "skiing plate" (paragraphs 1 and 6) comprising a translucent body (paragraph 6) and built-in luminescent equipment (LEDs; paragraphs 6 and 11; Drawing 2, item 6). Takahashi does not disclose expressly the means for supplying power to the LEDs comprising a magnet and a coil. Tsai et al. teach a self-powered advertisement board including wind-driven illuminating units. The invention of Tsai et al. comprises a fan blade (Figure 1, item 01; col. 3, line 3) rotated by the force of the wind, a rotary shaft (Figure 1, item 9), a

Art Unit: 2875

coil (Figure 1, item 050; col. 3, line 20) and a rotary magnet (Figure 1, item 051; col. 3, line 20) which are utilized to supply power to a light bulb (Figure 1, item 10; col. 3, line 13). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the power supply system of Takahashi such that it comprised a magnet and coil as is a conventional power source in the art and as is suggested by Tsai et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification in order to eliminate the reliance on a battery. Takahashi also does not disclose expressly the use of a light on a snowboard, however one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the functional equivalence of a "skiing plate" and a snowboard and would have been motivated to make similar modifications.

Regarding claim 3, Takahashi in view of Tsai teach the limitations set forth in claim 2. Takahashi in view of Tsai do not disclose expressly a plurality of transmission windows. However at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the conventional use of transmission windows to protect light emitting diodes from outside elements. At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to ensure that in the invention of Takahashi in view of Tsai transmission windows were provided in order to protect the LED components.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Art Unit: 2875

- a. Seifert et al. (US 6,431,733 B2) teach an illuminated sports board comprising a power source mounted on the top surface of the board and an electroluminescent sheet covered with a translucent resin layer (Abstract)
 - b. Redmond (US 6,402,165 B1) teaches a sliding toy comprising a plurality of lights housed in a transparent material, a power source (Figure 1, item 18), and a magnet for actuating the lights (col. 3 lines 58-59 to col. 4, lines 1-3).
 - c. Romuno (US 5,039,128 A) teaches a lighted ski (Abstract; Figure 1).
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Zettl whose telephone number is (571) 272-6007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Renee Luebke can be reached on (571) 272-2009. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

4m3
MZ


RENEE LUEBKE
PRIMARY EXAMINER